

# DIVISIBILITY BY 2 AND 3 OF CERTAIN STIRLING NUMBERS

DONALD M. DAVIS

ABSTRACT. The numbers  $\tilde{e}_p(k, n)$  defined as  $\min(\nu_p(S(k, j)j!) : j \geq n)$  appear frequently in algebraic topology. Here  $S(k, j)$  is the Stirling number of the second kind, and  $\nu_p(-)$  the exponent of  $p$ . Let  $s_p(n) = n - 1 + \nu_p([n/p]!)$ . The author and Sun proved that if  $L$  is sufficiently large, then  $\tilde{e}_p((p-1)p^L + n - 1, n) \geq s_p(n)$ .

In this paper, we determine the set of integers  $n$  for which  $\tilde{e}_p((p-1)p^L + n - 1, n) = s_p(n)$  when  $p = 2$  and when  $p = 3$ . The condition is roughly that, in the base- $p$  expansion of  $n$ , the sum of two consecutive digits must always be less than  $p$ . The result for divisibility of Stirling numbers is, when  $p = 2$ , that for such integers  $n$ ,  $\nu_2(S(2^L + n - 1, n)) = [(n-1)/2]$ .

We also present evidence for conjectures that, if  $n = 2^t$  or  $2^t + 1$ , then the maximum value over all  $k \geq n$  of  $\tilde{e}_2(k, n)$  is  $s_2(n) + 1$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $S(k, j)$  denote the Stirling number of the second kind. This satisfies

$$S(k, j)j! = (-1)^j \sum_{i=0}^j (-1)^i \binom{j}{i} i^k. \quad (1.1)$$

Let  $\nu_p(-)$  denote the exponent of  $p$ . For  $k \geq n$ , the numbers  $\tilde{e}_p(k, n)$  defined by

$$\tilde{e}_p(k, n) = \min(\nu_p(S(k, j)j!) : j \geq n) \quad (1.2)$$

are important in algebraic topology. We will discuss these applications in Section 6.

In [7], it was proved that, if  $L$  is sufficiently large, then

$$\tilde{e}_p((p-1)p^L + n - 1, n) \geq n - 1 + \nu_p([n/p]!). \quad (1.3)$$

Let  $s_p(n) = n - 1 + \nu_p([n/p]!)$ , as this will appear throughout the paper. Our main theorems, 1.7 and 1.9, give the sets of integers  $n$  for which equality occurs in (1.3)

---

*Date:* July 16, 2008.

*Key words and phrases.* Stirling number, divisibility, James numbers.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 11B73, 55Q52.

when  $p = 2$  and when  $p = 3$ . Before stating these, we make a slight reformulation to eliminate the annoying  $(p-1)p^L$ .

We define the partial Stirling numbers  $a_p(k, j)$  by

$$a_p(k, j) = \sum_{i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}} (-1)^i \binom{j}{i} i^k$$

and then

$$e_p(k, n) = \min(\nu_p(a_p(k, j)) : j \geq n). \quad (1.4)$$

Partial Stirling numbers have been studied in [10] and [9].

The following elementary and well-known proposition explains the advantage of using  $a_p(k, j)$  as a replacement for  $S(k, j)j!$ : it is that  $\nu_p(a_p(k, j))$  is periodic in  $k$ . In particular,  $\nu_p(a_p(n-1, n)) = \nu_p(a_p((p-1)p^L + n-1, n))$  for  $L$  sufficiently large, whereas  $S(n-1, n)n! = 0$ . Thus when using  $a_p(-)$ , we need not consider the  $(p-1)p^L$ . The second part of the proposition says that replacing  $S(k, j)j!$  by  $a_p(k, j)$  merely extends the numbers  $\tilde{e}_p(k, n)$  for  $k \geq n$  in which we are interested periodically to all integers  $k$ . An example ( $p = 3, n = 10$ ) is given in [4, p.543].

**Proposition 1.5.** *a. If  $t \geq \nu_p(a_p(k, j))$ , then*

$$\nu_p(a_p(k + (p-1)p^t, j)) = \nu_p(a_p(k, j)).$$

*b. If  $k \geq n$ , then  $e_p(k, n) = \tilde{e}_p(k, n)$ .*

*Proof.* a. ([3, 3.12]) For all  $t$ , we have

$$a_p(k + (p-1)p^t, j) - a_p(k, j) = \sum_{i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}} (-1)^i \binom{j}{i} i^k (i^{(p-1)p^t} - 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{t+1}},$$

from which the conclusion about  $p$ -exponents is immediate.

b. We have

$$(-1)^j S(k, j)j! - a_p(k, j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k} \quad (1.6)$$

since all its terms are multiples of  $p^k$ . Since  $\tilde{e}(k, n) \leq \nu(S(k, k)k!) < k$ , a multiple of  $p^k$  cannot affect this value. ■

Our first main result determines the set of values of  $n$  for which (1.3) is sharp when  $p = 2$ .

**Theorem 1.7.** *For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $e_2(n-1, n) = s_2(n)$  iff  $n = 2^\epsilon(2s+1)$  with  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 2$  and  $\binom{3s}{s}$  odd.*

**Remark 1.8.** Since  $\binom{3s}{s}$  is odd iff  $\text{binary}(s)$  has no consecutive 1's, another characterization of those  $n$  for which  $e_2(n-1, n) = s_2(n)$  is those satisfying  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ , and the only consecutive 1's in  $\text{binary}(n)$  are, at most, a pair at the end, followed perhaps by one or two 0's. Alternatively, except at the end, the sum of consecutive bits must be less than 2.

When  $p = 3$ , the description is similar.

**Theorem 1.9.** *Let  $T$  denote the set of positive integers for which the sum of two consecutive digits in the base-3 expansion is always less than 3. Let  $T' = \{n \in T : n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}\}$ . For integers  $a$  and  $b$ , let  $aT + b = \{an + b : n \in T\}$ , and similarly for  $T'$ . Then  $e_3(n-1, n) = s_3(n)$  if and only if*

$$n \in (3T + 1) \cup (3T' + 2) \cup (9T + 3).$$

**Remark 1.10.** Thus  $e_3(n-1, n) = s_3(n)$  iff  $n \not\equiv 0, 6 \pmod{9}$  and the only consecutive digits in the base-3 expansion of  $n$  whose sum is  $\geq 3$  are perhaps  $\cdots 21$ ,  $\cdots 12$ , or  $\cdots 210$ , each at the very end.

The following definition will be used throughout the paper.

**Definition 1.11.** *Let  $\bar{n}$  denote the residue of  $n$  mod  $p$ .*

The value of  $p$  will be clear from the context. Similarly  $\bar{x}$  denotes the residue of  $x$ , etc.

**Remark 1.12.** As our title suggests, we can interpret our results in terms of divisibility of Stirling numbers. Suppose  $p = 2$  or  $3$  and  $L$  is sufficiently large. The main theorem of [7] can be interpreted to say that

$$\nu_p(S((p-1)p^L + n - 1, n)) \geq (p-1)\left[\frac{n}{p}\right] + \bar{n} - 1. \quad (1.13)$$

Our main result is that equality occurs in (1.13) iff, for  $p = 3$ ,  $n$  is as in Theorem 1.9 with  $n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{9}$  or, for  $p = 2$ ,  $n$  is as in Theorem 1.7. We also show that, if  $p = 3$  and  $n = 9x + 2$ , then equality occurs in

$$\nu_3(S(2 \cdot 3^L + n - 1, n + 1)) \geq 6x$$

iff  $x \in T'$ .

In [12, (1.5)], a function  $T_{k,\alpha}^p(n, r)$  was introduced, relevant to the proof of (1.3). We recall it in Definition 2.8. Useful in our proofs of 1.7 and 1.9 is the explicit value mod  $p$  of  $T_{k,2}^p(n, r)$  when  $p = 2$  and 3. (See 2.10, 3.2, and 3.17.) We obtain this by relating it to  $T_{k,1}^p([\frac{n}{p}], [\frac{r}{p}])$  and then evaluating the latter. This extends [12, Thm 1.5] to the case  $\alpha = 1$ . Useful in this proof is Theorem 1.15, which is proved in Section 3 and might be of independent interest.

**Definition 1.14.** *If  $n$  is a positive integer and  $r$  is any integer, let*

$$S_1(n, r) = p^{-[\frac{n-1}{p-1}]} \sum_{k \equiv r \pmod{p}} (-1)^k \binom{n}{k}, \text{ and } S_2(n, r) = p^{-[\frac{n-1}{p-1}]} \sum_{k \equiv pr \pmod{p^2}} (-1)^k \binom{pn}{k}.$$

These are integers by [13]. They were also studied in [10]. The prime  $p$  is implicit.

**Theorem 1.15.** *Let  $p$  be an odd prime.*

- a. *For all  $r$ ,  $S_1(n, r) \equiv S_2(n, r) \pmod{p}$ .*
- b. *Mod  $p$ ,  $S_1(n, r) \equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^{s-1} & \text{if } n = (p-1)s \\ (-1)^{s-1}(\frac{s+1}{2} + r) & \text{if } n = (p-1)s - 1. \end{cases}$*
- c. *Mod  $p$ ,  $S_1(n + p(p-1), r) \equiv -S_1(n, r)$ .*

Of special interest in algebraic topology is

$$\bar{e}_p(n) := \max(e_p(k, n) : k \in \mathbb{Z}). \quad (1.16)$$

In Section 5, we discuss the relationship between  $\bar{e}_2(n)$ ,  $e_2(n-1, n)$ , and  $s_2(n)$ . We describe an approach there toward a proof of the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.17.** *If  $n = 2^t$ , then*

$$\bar{e}_2(n) = e_2(n-1, n) = s_2(n) + 1,$$

*while if  $n = 2^t + 1$ , then*

$$\bar{e}_2(n) = e_2(n-1, n) + 1 = s_2(n) + 1.$$

This conjecture suggests that the inequality  $e_2(n-1, n) \geq s_2(n)$  fails by 1 to be sharp if  $n = 2^t$ , while if  $n = 2^t + 1$ , it is sharp but the maximum value of  $e_2(k, n)$  occurs for a value of  $k \neq n-1$ .

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.7, utilizing results of [12] and some work with binomial coefficients. The starting point is the following result of [12]. In this section, we abbreviate  $\nu_2(-)$  as  $\nu(-)$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** ([12, 1.2]) *For all  $n \geq 0$  and  $k \geq 0$ ,*

$$\nu \left( 2^k k! \sum_i \binom{n}{4i+2} \binom{i}{k} \right) \geq \nu([n/2]!).$$

The bulk of the work is in proving the following refinement. The inequality is immediate from 2.1.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $n$  be as in Theorem 1.7, and, if  $n > 4$ , define  $n_0$  by  $n = 2^e + n_0$  with  $0 < n_0 < 2^{e-1}$ . Then*

$$\nu \left( \binom{n-1}{k} 2^k k! \sum_i \binom{n}{4i+2} \binom{i}{k} \right) \geq \nu([n/2]!) \quad (2.3)$$

*for all  $k$ , with equality if and only if*

$$k = \begin{cases} 0 & 1 \leq n \leq 4 \\ n_0 - 1 & n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}, n > 4 \\ n_0 - 2 & n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, n > 4. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

*Proof that Theorem 2.2 implies the “if” part of Theorem 1.7.* By (1.3),  $e_2(n-1, n) \geq s_2(n)$  for all  $n$ . Thus it will suffice to prove that if  $n$  is as in Theorem 2.2, then

$$\nu(a_2(n-1, n)) = s_2(n). \quad (2.5)$$

Note that

$$0 = (-1)^n S(n-1, n) n! = -a_2(n-1, n) + \sum \binom{n}{2k} (2k)^{n-1}.$$

Factoring  $2^{n-1}$  out of the sum shows that (2.5) will follow from showing

$$\sum \binom{n}{2k} k^{n-1} = \nu([n/2]!). \quad (2.6)$$

The sum in (2.6) may be restricted to odd values of  $k$ , since terms with even  $k$  are more 2-divisible than the claimed value. Write  $k = 2j + 1$  and apply the Binomial Theorem, obtaining

$$\sum_j \binom{n}{4j+2} \sum_\ell 2^\ell j^\ell \binom{n-1}{\ell} = \sum_j \binom{n}{4j+2} \sum_\ell 2^\ell \binom{n-1}{\ell} \sum_i S(\ell, i) i! \binom{j}{i}. \quad (2.7)$$

Here we have used the standard fact that  $j^\ell = \sum S(\ell, i) i! \binom{j}{i}$ .

Recall that  $S(\ell, i) = 0$  if  $\ell < i$ , and  $S(i, i) = 1$ . Terms in the right hand side of (2.7) with  $\ell = i$  yield

$$\sum_i \binom{n-1}{i} 2^i i! \sum_j \binom{n}{4j+2} \binom{j}{i},$$

which we shall call  $A_n$ . By Theorem 2.2, if  $n$  is as in Theorem 1.7,  $\nu(A_n) = \nu([n/2]!)$  since all  $i$ -summands have 2-exponent  $\geq \nu([n/2]!)$ , and exactly one of them has 2-exponent equal to  $\nu([n/2]!)$ . Terms in (2.7) with  $\ell > i$  satisfy

$$\nu(\text{term}) > \nu \left( 2^i i! \sum_j \binom{n}{4j+2} \binom{j}{i} \right),$$

the RHS of which is  $\geq \nu([n/2]!)$  by 2.1. The claim (2.6), and hence Theorem 1.7, follows. ■

We recall the following definition from [12, 1.5].

**Definition 2.8.** *Let  $p$  be any prime. For  $n, \alpha, k \geq 0$  and  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let*

$$T_{k,\alpha}^p(n, r) := \frac{k! p^k}{[n/p^{\alpha-1}]!} \sum_i (-1)^{p^\alpha i + r} \binom{n}{p^\alpha i + r} \binom{i}{k}.$$

In the remainder of this section, we have  $p = 2$  and omit writing it as a superscript of  $T$ .

By 2.1, Theorem 2.2 is equivalent to the following result, to the proof of which the rest of this section will be devoted.

**Theorem 2.9.** *If  $n$  is as in Theorem 2.2, then  $\binom{n-1}{k} T_{k,2}(n, 2)$  is odd if and only if  $k$  is as in (2.4).*

Central to the proof of 2.9 is the following result, which will be proved at the end of this section. This result applies to all values of  $n$ , not just those as in Theorem 2.2. This result is the complete evaluation of  $T_{k,2}(n, 2) \bmod 2$ .

**Theorem 2.10.** *If  $4k + 2 > n$ , then  $T_{k,2}(n, 2) = 0$ . If  $4k + 2 \leq n$ , then, mod 2,*

$$T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{[n/2] - k - 1}{[n/4]}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.9.* The cases  $n \leq 4$  are easily verified and not considered further.

First we establish that  $\binom{n-1}{k} T_{k,2}(n, 2)$  is odd for the stated values of  $k$ . We have

$$\binom{n-1}{k} = \begin{cases} \binom{2^e+n_0-1}{n_0-1} & \text{if } n_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4} \\ \binom{2^e+n_0-1}{n_0-2} & \text{if } n_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \end{cases}$$

which is clearly odd in both cases. Here and throughout we use the well-known fact that, if  $0 \leq \epsilon_i, \delta_i \leq p-1$ , then

$$\binom{\sum \epsilon_i p^i}{\sum \delta_i p^i} \equiv \prod \binom{\epsilon_i}{\delta_i} \pmod{p}. \quad (2.11)$$

Now we show that  $T_{k,2}(n, 2)$  is odd when  $n$  and  $k$  are as 1.7 and (2.4).

**Case 1:**  $n_0 = 8t + 4$  with  $\binom{3t}{t}$  odd, and  $k = 8t + 2$ . Using 2.10, with all equivalences mod 2,

$$T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{2^{e-1} + 4t + 2 - (8t + 2) - 1}{2^{e-2} + 2t + 1} \equiv \binom{-4t - 1}{2t + 1} \equiv \binom{6t + 1}{2t + 1} \equiv \binom{3t}{t}.$$

**Case 2:**  $n_0 = 4t + \epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\binom{3t}{t}$  odd,  $k = 4t + \epsilon - 1$ . Then

$$T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{2^{e-1} + 2t + \epsilon - 1 - (4t + \epsilon - 1) - 1}{2^{e-2} + t} \equiv \binom{-2t - 1}{t} \equiv \binom{3t}{t}.$$

**Case 3:**  $n_0 = 4t + 3$ ,  $\binom{3(2t+1)}{2t+1}$  odd,  $k = 4t + 2$ . Then

$$T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{2^{e-1} + 2t + 1 - (4t + 2) - 1}{2^{e-2} + t} \equiv \binom{-2t - 2}{t} \equiv \binom{3t + 1}{t} \equiv \binom{2(3t + 1) + 1}{2t + 1}.$$

Now we must show that, if  $n$  is as in Theorem 1.7 and  $k$  does not have the value specified in (2.4), then  $\binom{n-1}{k} T_{k,2}(n, 2)$  is even. The notation of Theorem 2.2 is continued. We divide into cases.

**Case 1:**  $k \geq n_0$ . Here  $\binom{n-1}{k}$  odd implies  $k \geq 2^e$ , but then  $4k + 2 > n$  and so by Theorem 2.10,  $T_{k,2}(n, 2) = 0$ . Hence  $\binom{n-1}{k} T_{k,2}(n, 2)$  is even.

**Case 2:**  $n_0 = 4t + 4$ ,  $k = n_0 - 1$ . Here  $T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{-(2t+2)}{t+1} \equiv \binom{3t+2}{t+1}$ . If  $t$  is even, this is even, and if  $t = 2s - 1$ , this is congruent to  $\binom{3s-1}{s}$  which is even, since if  $\nu(s) = w$ , then  $2^w \notin 3s - 1$ ; i.e., the decomposition of  $3s - 1$  as a sum of distinct 2-powers does not contain  $2^w$ .

**Case 3:**  $n_0 = 4t + \epsilon$ ,  $1 \leq \epsilon \leq 3$ , and  $k < n_0 - 1$ . Here

$$\binom{n-1}{k} T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{4t + \epsilon - 1}{k} \binom{2^{e-1} + 2t + [\epsilon/2] - k - 1}{2^{e-2} + t}.$$

If  $k \leq 2t + [\epsilon/2] - 1$ , then the second factor is even due to the  $i = e - 2$  factor in (2.11). If  $k > 2t + [\epsilon/2] - 1$ , the second factor is congruent to  $\binom{-(k+1-2t-[\epsilon/2])}{t} \equiv \binom{k-t-[\epsilon/2]}{t}$ . For  $\binom{4t+\epsilon-1}{k} \binom{k-t-[\epsilon/2]}{t}$  to be odd would require one of the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon = 1, \quad k = 4i, \quad \text{and} \quad \binom{t}{i} \binom{4i-t}{t} \text{ odd} \\ \epsilon = 2, \quad k = 4i + \langle 0, 1 \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \binom{t}{i} \binom{4i-t-\langle 1, 0 \rangle}{t} \text{ odd.} \\ \epsilon = 3, \quad k = 4i + \langle 0, 2 \rangle, \quad \binom{t}{i} \binom{4i-t+\langle -1, 1 \rangle}{t} \text{ odd.} \end{aligned}$$

But all these products are even if  $i < t$  by Lemma 2.14. If  $i = t$ , since  $k < n_0 - 1$ , we obtain a  $\binom{3t-1}{t}$  factor, which is even, as in Case 2.

**Case 4:**  $n_0 = 4t + 4$  and  $k < n_0 - 2$ . Note that  $t$  must be even since  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8}$  in 2.2. We have

$$\binom{n-1}{k} T_{k,2}(n, 2) \equiv \binom{4t+3}{k} \binom{2^{e-1} + 2t + 1 - k}{2^{e-2} + t + 1}.$$

The case  $k \leq 2t + 1$  is handled as in Case 3. If  $k > 2t + 1$ , then, similarly to Case 3, it reduces to  $\binom{4t+3}{k} \binom{k-t-1}{t+1}$ . If  $k = 4t$  or  $4t + 1$ , then we obtain  $\binom{3t-1}{t+1}$  or  $\binom{3t}{t+1}$ , which are even since  $t$  is even. Now suppose  $k = 4i + \Delta$  with  $0 \leq \Delta \leq 3$  and  $i < t$ . Since  $t$  is even, if  $\Delta$  is odd, then  $\binom{k-t-1}{t+1}$  is even. For  $\Delta = 0$  or  $2$ , we obtain  $\binom{t}{i} \binom{4i-t\pm 1}{t+1}$ . Since  $t$  is even, we use  $\binom{2A+1}{2B+1} \equiv \binom{2A}{2B}$  to obtain  $\binom{t}{i} \binom{4i-t-\langle 0, 2 \rangle}{t}$ , which is even by Lemma 2.14. ■

The following result implies the “only if” part of Theorem 1.7.

**Theorem 2.12.** *Assume  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$  or  $n = 2^\epsilon(2s + 1)$  with  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 2$  and  $\binom{3s}{s}$  even. Then for all  $N \geq n$ , we have  $\nu_2(a_2(n-1, N)) > s_2(n)$ .*

*Proof.* Combining aspects of 2.2, 2.10, and 4.21, the theorem will follow from showing that for  $n$  as in the theorem and  $N \geq n$  satisfying  $[N/4] = [n/4]$ , we have

$$\sum_{4k+2 \leq N} \binom{n-1}{k} \binom{[N/2] - k - 1}{[N/4]} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (2.13)$$

Note that if  $[N/4] > [n/4]$ , then  $\frac{[N/2]!}{[n/2]!}$  is even in the 2-primary analogue of the proof of 4.21.

When  $n = 8\ell$ , it is required to show that  $\sum \binom{8\ell-1}{k} \binom{4\ell-k-1}{2\ell}$  and  $\sum \binom{8\ell-1}{k} \binom{4\ell-k}{2\ell}$  are both even. The first corresponds to  $N = n$  or  $n + 1$ , and the second to  $N = n + 2$  or

$n + 3$ . The first is proved by noting easily that the summands for  $k = 2j$  and  $2j + 1$  are equal. The second follows from showing that the summands for  $k = 2j$  and  $2j - 1$  are equal. This is easy unless  $2j = 8i$ . For this, we need to know that  $\binom{2\ell-4i}{\ell}\binom{\ell}{i}$  is always even, and this follows easily from showing that the binary expansions of  $\ell - 4i$ ,  $\ell - i$ , and  $i$  cannot be disjoint.

For  $n = 2^e(2s + 1)$  with  $\binom{3s}{s}$  even, all summands in (2.13) can be shown to be even when  $n = 2^e + n_0$  with  $0 < n_0 < 2^{e-1}$  and  $N = n$  using the proof of Theorem 2.9. For such  $n$  and  $N > n$ , the main case to consider is  $n = 8a + 4$  and  $N = n + 2$ . Then we need  $\binom{8a+3}{k}\binom{4a+2-k}{2a+1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . For this to be false,  $k$  must be odd. But then we have

$$\binom{8a+3}{k}\binom{4a+2-k}{2a+1} \equiv \binom{8a+3}{k-1}\binom{4a+1-(k-1)}{2a+1} \equiv 0$$

by the result for  $N = n$  with  $k$  replaced by  $k - 1$ .

If  $n = 2^{e+d} + \dots + 2^e + n_0$  with  $d > 0$  and  $0 < n_0 < 2^{e-1}$ , then (2.13) for  $n = N$  is proved when  $k$  does not have the special value of (2.4) just as in the second part of the proof of 2.9. We illustrate what happens when  $k$  does have the special value by considering what happens to Case 1 just after (2.11). The binomial coefficient there becomes

$$\binom{2^{e+d-1} + \dots + 2^{e-1} - 4t - 1}{2^{e+d-2} + \dots + 2^{e-2} + 2t + 1},$$

which is 0 mod 2 by consideration of the  $2^{e-1}$  position in (2.11). For  $N > n$ , the argument is essentially the same as that of the previous paragraph. ■

The following lemma was used above.

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $i < t$ ,  $-2 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , and if  $\delta = -2$ , assume that  $t$  is even. Then  $\binom{t}{i}\binom{4i-t+\delta}{t}$  is even.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\binom{t}{i}\binom{4i-t+\delta}{t}$  is odd. Then  $i$ ,  $t - i$ , and  $4i - 2t + \delta$  have disjoint binary expansions. If  $\delta = 0$  or  $1$ , then letting  $\ell = t - i$  and  $r = 2i - t$ , we infer that  $\ell + r$ ,  $\ell$ , and  $2r$  are disjoint with  $\ell$  and  $r$  positive, which is impossible by Sublemma 2.15.2. If  $\delta = -1$  and  $t$  is odd, then two of  $i$ ,  $t - i$ , and  $4i - 2t - 1$  are odd, and so they cannot be disjoint. Thus we may assume  $t$  is even and  $\delta = -1$  or  $-2$ . Let  $\ell = t - i$  and  $r = 2i - t - 1$ . Then  $\ell + r + 1$ ,  $\ell$ , and  $2r$  are disjoint with  $\ell$  and  $r$  positive and  $r$  odd, which is impossible by Sublemma 2.15.3. ■

**Sublemma 2.15.** *Let  $\ell$  and  $r$  be nonnegative integers.*

- (1) *Then  $\ell$ ,  $2r + 1$ , and  $\ell + r + 1$  do not have disjoint binary expansions.*
- (2) *If  $\ell$  and  $r$  are positive, then  $\ell$ ,  $2r$ , and  $\ell + r$  do not have disjoint binary expansions.*
- (3) *If  $\ell$  is positive and  $r$  is odd, then  $\ell$ ,  $2r$ , and  $\ell + r + 1$  do not have disjoint binary expansions.*

*Proof.* (1) Assume that  $\ell$  and  $r$  constitute a minimal counterexample. We must have  $\ell = 2\ell'$  and  $r = 2r' + 1$ . Then  $\ell'$  and  $r'$  yield a smaller counterexample.

(2) Assume that  $\ell$  and  $r$  constitute a minimal counterexample. If  $r$  is even, then  $\ell$  must be even, and so dividing each by 2 gives a smaller counterexample. If  $r = 1$ , then  $\ell$ , 2, and  $\ell + 1$  are disjoint, which is impossible, since the only way for  $\ell$  and  $\ell + 1$  to be disjoint is if  $\ell = 2^e - 1$ . If  $r = 2r' + 1$  with  $r' > 0$ , and  $\ell = 2\ell'$ , then  $\ell'$  and  $r'$  form a smaller counterexample. If  $r = 2r' + 1$  and  $\ell = 2\ell' + 1$ , then  $\ell'$ ,  $2r' + 1$ , and  $\ell' + r' + 1$  are disjoint, contradicting (1).

(3) Let  $r = 2r' + 1$ . Then  $\ell$  must be even ( $= 2\ell'$ ). Then  $\ell'$ ,  $2r' + 1$ , and  $\ell' + r' + 1$  are disjoint, contradicting (1). ■

The following lemma together with Theorem 3.2 implies Theorem 2.10. Its proof uses the following definition, which will be employed throughout the paper.

**Definition 2.16.** *Let  $d_p(-)$  denote the number of 1's in the  $p$ -ary expansion.*

**Lemma 2.17.** *Mod 2,*

$$T_{k,1}(n, r) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{n-k-1}{\lfloor (n-1+\overline{r})/2 \rfloor} & n > k \\ 0 & n \leq k \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $k$ . Let  $f_k(n, r)$  denote the RHS of (2.18) mod 2. It is easy to check that  $f_0(n, r) = \delta_{d_2(n), 1}$ , agreeing with  $T_{0,1}(n, r)$  as determined in (3.4). Here and throughout  $\delta_{i,j}$  is the Kronecker function. From Definition 2.8, mod 2,  $T_{k,1}(1, r) \equiv \delta_{k,0}$ . This is what causes the dichotomy in (2.18).

By [12, (2.3)], if  $k > 0$ , then

$$T_{k,1}(n, r) + rT_{k-1,1}(n, r+2) = -T_{k-1,1}(n-1, r+1). \quad (2.19)$$

Noting that  $f$  only depends on the mod 2 value of  $r$ , the lemma follows from

$$\begin{aligned} f_k(n, 0) &= f_{k-1}(n-1, 1) \\ f_k(n, 1) &= f_{k-1}(n, 1) + f_{k-1}(n-1, 0), \end{aligned}$$

which are immediate from the definition of  $f$  and Pascal's formula. ■

### 3. MOD $p$ VALUES OF $T$ -FUNCTION

We saw in Theorem 2.9 that knowledge of the mod 2 value of the  $T$ -function of [12] played an essential role in proving Theorem 1.7. A similar situation occurs when  $p = 3$ . The principal goal of this section is the determination of  $T_{k,2}^3(n, r)$ , obtained by combining Theorems 3.2 and 3.17. We also prove Theorem 1.15, which is used in the proof of 3.2, but may be of intrinsic interest.

We begin by recording a well-known proposition which will be used throughout the paper.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $n \geq 0$ , then  $\nu_p(n!) = \frac{1}{p-1}(n - d_p(n))$ , and hence  $\nu_p\left(\binom{n}{b}\right) = \frac{1}{p-1}(d_p(b) + d_p(n-b) - d_p(n))$ .*

The following result extends [12, Thm 1.5] to include the case  $\alpha = 1$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $p$  be any prime. For any  $\alpha \geq 1$ , we have the congruence, mod  $p$ ,*

$$T_{k,\alpha+1}^p(n, r) \equiv (-1)^{\bar{r}} \binom{\bar{n}}{\bar{r}} T_{k,\alpha}^p\left(\left[\frac{n}{p}\right], \left[\frac{r}{p}\right]\right).$$

*Proof.* This was proved for  $\alpha \geq 2$  in [12, Thm 1.5]. The only place that the proof of that result does not work when  $\alpha = 1$  is in the initial step of Case 3 of [12, p.5548]. Required to complete that proof is

$$T_{0,2}^p(pn, pr) \equiv T_{0,1}^p(n, r) \pmod{p}.$$

This just says, mod  $p$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{i \equiv pr \pmod{p^2}} (-1)^i \binom{pn}{i} \equiv \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{i \equiv r \pmod{p}} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i}. \quad (3.3)$$

When  $p$  is odd, this follows immediately from part a of Theorem 1.15, since  $\nu_p(n!) \leq [(n-1)/(p-1)]$ .

We prove (3.3) when  $p = 2$  by showing that both sides equal  $\delta_{1,d_2(n_0)}$ . The RHS equals

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-d_2(n)}u} \cdot 2^{n-1} \equiv 2^{d_2(n)-1} \equiv \delta_{d_2(n),1} \pmod{2}, \quad (3.4)$$

with  $u$  odd, while the LHS is  $\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{i \equiv 2r \pmod{4}} \binom{2n}{i} \equiv \frac{1}{2^{n-d_2(n)}} \cdot \begin{cases} 2^{2n-2} & n \text{ odd} \\ 2^{n-1}u' & n \text{ even,} \end{cases}$  and this also equals  $\delta_{d_2(n),1}$ . Here we have used

$$\sum_{i \equiv r \pmod{4}} \binom{n}{i} = 2^{n-2+\epsilon_{n,r}} 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}, \text{ with } \epsilon_{n,r} = \begin{cases} 0 & n - 2r \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \\ 1 & n - 2r \equiv -1, 0, 1 \pmod{8} \\ -1 & n - 2r \equiv 3, 4, 5 \pmod{8}, \end{cases}$$

which is easily proved by induction on  $n$ .  $\blacksquare$

Next we discuss Theorem 1.15 and give its proof. First we note that the definitions of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  in it are similar to [12, (3.4)], but differ regarding the role of the second variable in  $S_2$ . We remark that part b of 1.15 was given by Lundell in [10], although he merely said “the proof is a straightforward but somewhat tedious induction.” Part a is of particular interest to us.

*Proof of Theorem 1.15.* Throughout this proof,  $p$  denotes an odd prime. We will work with polynomials in the ring  $R := \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^p - 1)$ . In  $R$ , let

$$P_n(x) = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} S_1(n, r) x^r \text{ and } Q_n(x) = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} S_2(n, r) x^r. \quad (3.5)$$

Also in  $R$ , let

$$\psi(x) = \frac{(1-x)^p - (1-x^p)}{p(1-x)} = \frac{(1-x)^{p-1} - (1 + \cdots + x^{p-1})}{p}.$$

We will prove later the following result, which immediately implies part a.

**Theorem 3.6.** *For  $1 \leq d \leq p-1$  and  $m \geq 0$ , we have in  $R$*

$$P_{(p-1)m+d}(x) = \psi(x)^m (1-x)^d = Q_{(p-1)m+d}(x).$$

Parts b and c follow from Theorem 3.6 and the following result, which we will also prove later. The numbering of the parts is related to the corresponding part of Theorem 1.15.

**Lemma 3.7.** *We have, in  $R$ ,*

- b.i.  $(\psi(x) + 1)(1 - x)^{p-1} = 0$ ,
- b.ii.  $(\psi(x) + x^{(p-1)/2})(1 - x)^{p-2} = 0$ , and
- c.  $\psi(x)^p = -1$ .

The deduction of 1.15.bc is straightforward. For the first part of b, we have in  $R$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (-1)^{s-1}(1 + x + \cdots + x^{p-1}) \\
 &= (-1)^{s-1}(1 - x)^{p-1} \\
 &= \psi(x)^{s-1}(1 - x)^{p-1} \\
 &= P_{(p-1)s}(x) \\
 &= \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} S_1((p-1)s, r)x^r.
 \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $(1 - x)^{p-2} = 1 + 2x + 3x^2 + \cdots + (p-1)x^{p-2}$ , the second part of 3.6.b follows from the following analysis of coefficients of polynomials in  $R$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 & S_1((p-1)(s-1) + p-2, r) \\
 &= [x^r]P_{(p-1)(s-1)+p-2}(x) \\
 &= [x^r](\psi(x)^{s-1}(1 - x)^{p-2}) \\
 &= [x^r]((-1)^{s-1}x^{(s-1)(p-1)/2}(1 - x)^{p-2}) \\
 &= (-1)^{s-1}[x^{r+(s-1)/2}](1 - x)^{p-2} \\
 &= (-1)^{s-1}(r + (s-1)/2 + 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that exponents of  $x$  may be considered mod  $p$ . The deduction of 1.15.c from 3.7.c is much easier, and omitted. ■

*Proof of Theorem 3.6.* We first show the theorem is true when  $m = 0$ . The argument for  $P$  is similar to, and easier than, the following argument for  $Q$ . Let  $1 \leq d \leq p-1$ . Note that, mod  $p$ ,

$$Q_d(x^p) = \sum_r S_2(d, r)x^{pr} = \sum_r (-1)^{pr} \binom{pd}{pr} x^{pr} \equiv \sum_{r=0}^d (-1)^r \binom{d}{r} x^{pr} = (1 - x^p)^d.$$

Thus the same is true when  $x^p$  is replaced by  $x$ . Note that here we are dealing with polynomials mod  $p$ , but not in the ring  $R$  used earlier.

Next we prove that for any  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p-1}$

$$P_{n+p-1}(x) = \psi(x)P_n(x) \quad (3.8)$$

in  $R$ . To see this, first note that if  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p-1}$ ,

$$S_1(n, r) = S_1(n-1, r) - S_1(n-1, r-1). \quad (3.9)$$

Note that the need for  $n \not\equiv 1$  is so that  $[(n-1)/(p-1)] = [(n-2)/(p-1)]$ . Similarly, for  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p-1}$

$$S_1(n+p-1, r) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=0}^p (-1)^i \binom{p}{i} S_1(n-1, r-i). \quad (3.10)$$

Since  $S_1(n-1, r) = S_1(n-1, r-p)$ , this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(n+p-1, r) &= \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i \frac{1}{p} \binom{p}{i} S_1(n-1, r-i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} \alpha_i S_1(n, r-i), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} \alpha_i x^i. \quad (3.12)$$

At the last step, we have used (3.9). The equation (3.11) translates to (3.8).

A similar argument, sketched below, shows that for any  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p-1}$

$$Q_{n+p-1}(x) = \psi(x)Q_n(x) \quad (3.13)$$

in  $R$ . The  $S_2$ -analogue of (3.9) is true mod  $p$ , obtained from

$$S_2(n, r) = S_2(n-1, r) + p^{-[\frac{n-1}{p-1}]} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i \binom{p}{i} \sum_{k \equiv pr-i \pmod{p^2}} (-1)^k \binom{p(n-1)}{k} - S_2(n-1, r-1)$$

by noting that the  $k$ -sums are divisible by  $p^{[(n-1)/(p-1)]}$  by [13], and so since  $\binom{p}{i} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then each  $i$ -summand is  $0 \pmod{p}$ . The  $S_2$ -analogue of (3.10), mod  $p$ , is obtained similarly, using that  $(1-x)^{p^2} \equiv (1-x^p)^p \pmod{p}$ . The argument for (3.13) is completed as in (3.11).

Theorem 3.6 with  $d \neq 1$  is immediate from (3.8) and (3.13) plus the validity when  $m = 0$  established in the first paragraph of this proof. The proof when  $d = 1$  requires the following three lemmas.

**Lemma 3.14.** *If  $n$  is odd and  $n - 2r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then  $S_1(n, r) = 0 = S_2(n, r)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $n - r \equiv r \pmod{p}$ , both  $\binom{n}{r}$  and  $\binom{n}{n-r}$  occur in the sum for  $S_1(n, r)$ , and with opposite sign since  $n$  is odd. Hence all terms in the sum occur in cancelling pairs. The same is true of all terms in the sum for  $S_2(n, r)$  since  $pn - pr \equiv pr \pmod{p^2}$ . ■

**Lemma 3.15.** *If  $(1 - x)f(x) = 0$  in  $R$ , then  $f(x) = c(1 + x + \cdots + x^{p-1})$  for some  $c$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f(x) = c_0 + c_1x + \cdots + c_{p-1}x^{p-1}$ . The given equation implies  $c_0 = c_1 = \cdots = c_{p-1}$ . ■

**Lemma 3.16.** *For  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $R_t \subset R$  denote the span of  $x^i - x^{t-i}$  for all  $i$ . If  $g(x) \in R_t$ , then  $g(x)\psi(x) \in R_{t-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\psi(x)$  is a linear combination of various  $x^j + x^{p-1-j}$ , the lemma follows from the observation that

$$(x^i - x^{t-i})(x^j + x^{p-1-j}) = x^{i+j} - x^{t-1-i-j} + x^{i-1-j} - x^{t+j-i}.$$

■

Note that if  $g(x) \in R_t$ , then  $[x^{t/2}]g(x) = 0$ .

Now we prove the case  $d = 1$  of Theorem 3.6. We have

$$P_{(p-1)m+1}(x) \cdot (1 - x) = P_{(p-1)m+2}(x) = (1 - x)^2\psi(x)^m.$$

By Lemma 3.15,  $\Delta_m(x) := P_{(p-1)m+1}(x) - (1 - x)\psi(x)^m$  has all coefficients equal. By Lemma 3.14, if  $(p - 1)m + 1 - 2r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then  $[x^r]P_{(p-1)m+1}(x) = 0$ . Note that here  $r = (1 - m)/2$ , with exponents always considered mod  $p$  in  $R$ . In the notation of Lemma 3.16,  $1 - x \in R_1$ , and hence by that lemma,  $(1 - x)\psi(x)^m \in R_{1-m}$ . Thus  $[x^{(1-m)/2}]((1 - x)\psi(x)^m) = 0$ . Thus  $[x^{(1-m)/2}]\Delta_m(x) = 0$ , and hence  $\Delta_m(x) = 0$ , as desired. ■

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* To prove b.i., we prove  $\psi(x)+1$  is divisible by  $(1-x)$  by showing  $\psi(1) \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ . Note that  $\sum_{i=0}^{p-1}((-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} - 1) = -p$ , and hence

$$\psi(1) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1}((-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} - 1) = -1.$$

To prove b.ii., we prove  $g(x) := \psi(x) + x^{(p-1)/2}$  is divisible by  $(1-x)^2$ . Since  $g(1) = 0$ , it remains to show that the derivative satisfies  $g'(1) = 0$ ; i.e., that  $\psi'(1) + \frac{p-1}{2} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Let  $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{p}((-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} - 1)$ . Then  $\psi'(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i\alpha_i$ . Since

$$-(p-1)(1-x)^{p-2} = \frac{d}{dx}(1-x)^{p-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} ix^{i-1},$$

setting  $x = 1$  shows  $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} i = 0$  and thus

$$p\psi'(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} pi\alpha_i = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} ((-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} - 1)i = -\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i = -\frac{p(p-1)}{2},$$

and hence  $\psi'(1) + \frac{p-1}{2} = 0$ , as desired.

To prove c, we use  $x^p = 1$ ,  $(A+B)^p \equiv A^p + B^p$ , and  $i^p \equiv i$ , and obtain, in  $R$ ,

$$\psi(x)^p = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{(-1)^i \binom{p-1}{i} - 1}{p} = 0 - 1.$$

■

Now we give the mod 3 values of  $T_{k,1}^3(-, -)$ . The mod 3 values of  $T_{k,2}^3(-, -)$  can be obtained from this using Theorem 3.2. Throughout the rest of this section and the next, the superscript 3 on  $T$  is implicit.

**Theorem 3.17.** *Let  $n = 3m + \delta$  with  $0 \leq \delta \leq 2$ .*

- *If  $n - k = 2\ell$ , then, mod 3,  $T_{k,1}(n, r)$  is given by*

|              |      | $\delta$              |                     |                      |
|--------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
|              |      | 0                     | 1                   | 2                    |
| $r \pmod{3}$ | 0    | $\binom{\ell-1}{m-1}$ | $\binom{\ell-1}{m}$ | $-\binom{\ell-1}{m}$ |
|              | 1, 2 | $-\binom{\ell-1}{m}$  | $\binom{\ell-1}{m}$ | $-\binom{\ell-1}{m}$ |

- *If  $n - k = 2\ell + 1$ , then, mod 3,  $T_{k,1}(n, r)$  is given by*

|              |   | $\delta$           |                    |   |
|--------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|
|              |   | 0                  | 1                  | 2 |
| $r \pmod{3}$ | 0 | 0                  | $\binom{\ell}{m}$  | 0 |
|              | 1 | $\binom{\ell}{m}$  | $-\binom{\ell}{m}$ | 0 |
|              | 2 | $-\binom{\ell}{m}$ | 0                  | 0 |

*Proof.* By [12, (2.3)], we have

$$T_{k,1}(n, r) + rT_{k-1,1}(n, r+3) = -T_{k-1,1}(n-1, r+2), \quad (3.18)$$

yielding an inductive determination of  $T_{k,1}$  starting with  $T_{0,1}$ . One can verify that the mod 3 formulas of Theorem 3.17 also satisfy (3.18). For example, if  $r \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $n-k = 2\ell$ , then for  $\delta = 0, 1, 2$ , (3.18) becomes, respectively,  $-\binom{\ell-1}{m} + \binom{\ell}{m} = \binom{\ell-1}{m-1}$ ,  $\binom{\ell-1}{m} - \binom{\ell}{m} = -\binom{\ell-1}{m-1}$ , and  $-\binom{\ell-1}{m} + 0 = -\binom{\ell-1}{m}$ .

To initiate the induction we show that, mod 3,

$$T_{0,1}(n, r) \equiv \begin{cases} 2 & n = 2 \cdot 3^e \\ 1 & n = 3^{e_1} + 3^{e_2}, \ 0 \leq e_1 < e_2 \\ r & n = 3^e, \ e > 0 \\ r+1 & n = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

and observe that the tabulated formulas for  $k = 0$  also equal (3.19). The latter can be proved by considering separately  $n = 6t + d$  for  $0 \leq d \leq 5$ . For example, if  $d = 3$ , then  $m = 2t + 1$ ,  $\delta = 0$ , and  $n - k = 2(3t + 1) + 1$ . For  $r \equiv 0, 1, 2$ , the tabulated value is, respectively, 0,  $\binom{3t+1}{2t+1}$ ,  $-\binom{3t+1}{2t+1}$ . Using Proposition 3.1, one shows  $\nu_3\left(\binom{3t+1}{2t+1}\right) = d_3(2t+1) - 1$ . Thus the tabulated value in these cases is 0 mod 3 unless  $2t + 1$ , hence  $6t + 3$ , is a 3-power, and in this case  $\binom{3t+1}{2t+1} \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

To see (3.19), we note that

$$T_{0,1}(n, r) = \frac{3^{[(n-1)/2]}}{n!} S_1(n, r)$$

with  $S_1$  as in Theorem 1.15, and that, mod 3,

$$\frac{3^{[(n-1)/2]}}{n!} \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & n = 3^{2e} \text{ or } 3^e + 3^{e+2k} \\ 2 & n = 3^{2e+1}, \ 2 \cdot 3^e, \text{ or } 3^e + 3^{e+2k-1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, for example, mod 3, if  $e > 0$ , then, using Theorem 1.15

$$T_{0,1}(3^{2e}, r) \equiv S_1(3^{2e}, r) = (-1)^{(3^{2e}-1)/2} \left( \frac{3^{2e} + 3}{4} + r \right) \equiv r,$$

in agreement with (3.19).  $\blacksquare$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.9

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.9. We begin with a result, 4.3, which reduces much of the analysis to evaluation of binomial coefficients mod 3.

**Definition 4.1.** For  $\epsilon = \pm 1$ , let  $\tau(n, k, \epsilon) := T_{k,1}(n, 1) + \epsilon T_{k,1}(n, 2)$ , mod 3.

The following result is immediate from Theorem 3.17.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let  $n = 3m + \delta$  with  $0 \leq \delta \leq 2$ . If  $n - k = 2\ell$ , then, mod 3,  $\tau(n, k, -1) \equiv 0$ , while  $\tau(n, k, 1) \equiv (-1)^\delta \binom{\ell-1}{m}$ . If  $n - k = 2\ell + 1$ , then, mod 3,

$$\tau(n, k, \epsilon) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \delta = 2 \text{ or } \epsilon = 1 \text{ and } \delta = 0 \\ -\binom{\ell}{m} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following result is a special case of Theorem 4.21, which is proved later.

**Theorem 4.3.** Define

$$\phi(n) := \sum \binom{n-1}{k} \tau\left(\left[\frac{n}{3}\right], k, (-1)^{n-k-1}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}/3. \quad (4.4)$$

Then  $\nu_3(a_3(n-1, n)) = s_3(n)$  if and only if  $\phi(n) \neq 0$ .

The following definition will be used throughout this section.

**Definition 4.5.** An integer  $x$  is sparse if its base-3 expansion has no 2's or adjacent 1's. The pair  $(x, i)$  is special if  $x$  is sparse and  $i = x - \max\{3^{a_j} : 3^{a_j} \in x\}$ .

Some special pairs are  $(9, 0)$ ,  $(10, 1)$ ,  $(30, 3)$ , and  $(91, 10)$ .

Lemma 4.7 will be used frequently. Its proof uses the following sublemma, which is easily proved.

**Sublemma 4.6.** Let  $F_1(x, i) = (3x, 3i)$  and  $F_2(x, i) = (9x + 1, 9i + 1)$ . The special pairs are those that can be obtained from  $(1, 0)$  by repeated application of  $F_1$  and/or  $F_2$ .

For example  $(3^7 + 3^3 + 3, 3^3 + 3) = F_1 F_2 F_2 F_1 F_1(1, 0)$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *Mod 3,*

- (1) *If  $x - i$  is even, then  $\binom{x}{i} \binom{(3x-9i)/2}{x} \equiv 0$ ;*
- (2) *If  $x - i$  is odd, then  $\binom{x}{i} \binom{(3x-9i-1)/2}{x} \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (x, i) \text{ special} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$*
- (3) *If  $x-i$  is odd, then  $\binom{x}{i} \binom{(3x-9i-3)/2}{x} \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (x, i) \text{ special and } x \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$*

*Proof.* We make frequent use of (2.11).

(1) If  $\binom{x}{i} \not\equiv 0$ , then  $\nu_3(i) \geq \nu_3(x)$ , but then the second factor is  $\equiv 0$  for a similar reason.

(2) Say  $(x, i)$  satisfies  $C$  if  $\binom{x}{i} \binom{(3x-9i-1)/2}{x} \not\equiv 0$ . Note that  $(1, 0)$  satisfies  $C$ . We will show that  $(x, i)$  satisfies  $C$  iff either  $(x, i) = (3x', 3i')$  and  $(x', i')$  satisfies  $C$  or  $(x, i) = (9x'' + 1, 9i'' + 1)$  and  $(x'', i'')$  satisfies  $C$ . The result then follows from the sublemma and the observation that the binomial coefficients maintain a value of 1 mod 3.

If  $x = 3x'$ , then  $\binom{x}{i} \not\equiv 0$  implies  $i = 3i'$ . Then

$$\binom{(3x-9i-1)/2}{x} \equiv \binom{(9x'-27i'-1)/2}{3x'} \equiv \binom{(\frac{1}{2}(9x'-27i'-3)+1)}{3x'} \equiv \binom{(3x'-9i'-1)/2}{x'}.$$

If  $x = 3x' + 1$ , then  $0 \not\equiv \binom{\frac{1}{2}(9x'-9i)+1}{3x'+1}$  implies  $x' = 3x''$ . The product becomes  $\binom{9x''+1}{i} \binom{(3x''-i)/2}{x''}$ . For this to be nonzero,  $i$  cannot be  $9i''$  by consideration of the second factor, similarly to case (1). If  $i = 9i'' + 1$ , the product becomes  $\binom{x''}{i''} \binom{(3x''-9i''-1)/2}{x''}$ , as claimed. If  $x = 3x' + 2$ , a nonzero second factor would require the impossible condition  $(9x' - 9i + 5)/2 \equiv 2$ .

(3) To get nonzero, we must have  $x = 3x'$  then  $i = 3i'$ . The product then becomes  $\binom{x'}{i'} \binom{(3x'-9i'-1)/2}{x'}$ , which is analyzed using case (2). ■

Next we prove a theorem which, with 4.3, implies one part of the “if” part of Theorem 1.9.

**Theorem 4.8.** *With  $T$  as in Theorem 1.9, if  $n \in (3T + 1)$  then  $\phi(n) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Define  $f_1(x) = \phi(3x + 1)$ . The lengthy proof breaks up into four cases, which are easily seen to imply the result, that

$$f_1(x) \neq 0 \text{ if } x \in T. \quad (4.9)$$

- (1) If  $x$  is sparse, then  $f_1(x) \neq 0$ .
- (2) For all  $x$ ,  $f_1(3x) = f_1(x)$ .
- (3) If  $x$  is not sparse and  $x \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , or if  $x$  is sparse and  $x \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then  $f_1(3x + 1) = \pm f_1(x)$ .
- (4) If  $x \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then  $f_1(3x + 2) = f_1(x)$ .

Moreover, this inductive proof of (4.9) will establish at each step that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } \binom{3x}{k} \tau(x, k, (-1)^{x-k}) \neq 0, \text{ then } 3x - k \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ &\text{unless } (3x, k) \text{ is special.} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

**Case 1:** Let  $x$  be sparse and

$$3x = \sum_{j=1}^t 3^{a_j}$$

with  $a_j - a_{j-1} \geq 2$  for  $2 \leq j \leq t$ . Then

$$f_1(x) = \sum \binom{3x}{3i} \tau(x, 3i, (-1)^{x-i}).$$

We will show that

$$\binom{3x}{3i} \tau(x, 3i, (-1)^{x-i}) = \begin{cases} -1 & 3i = 3x - 3^{a_t} \\ (-1)^j & 3i = 3x - 3^{a_t} - 3^{a_j}, j \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

This will imply Case 1.

In the first case of (4.11),  $(x, i)$  is special. If  $x = 3x'$ , then  $i = 3i'$  with  $(x', i')$  special, and we have

$$\tau(x, 3i, -1) = -\binom{(3x' - 9i' - 1)/2}{x'} \equiv -1$$

by Lemma 4.7.(2). If  $x = 3x' + 1$ , then  $i = 3i' + 1$  with  $(x', i')$  special. Also, since  $x$  is sparse, we must have  $x' = 3x''$  and then  $i' = 3i''$ . Thus

$$\tau(x, 3i, -1) = -\binom{(x - 3i - 1)/2}{x'} = -\binom{(3x'' - 9i'' - 1)/2}{x''} \equiv -1$$

by Lemma 4.7.(2).

For the second case of (4.11), let  $3i = 3x - 3^{a_t} - 3^{a_j}$ . This time  $x - 3i = 2\ell$  with

$$\ell = \sum_{s=a_{t-1}}^{a_t-2} 3^s + \cdots + \sum_{s=a_{j+1}}^{a_{j+2}-2} 3^s + \sum_{s=a_{j-1}}^{a_j-2} 3^s + \cdots + \sum_{s=a_1}^{a_2-2} 3^s + \sum_{s=a_1}^{a_{j+1}-2} 3^s + 2 \cdot 3^{a_1-1}.$$

Then  $\ell - 1$  is obtained from this by replacing  $2 \cdot 3^{a_1-1}$  with  $3^{a_1-1} + 2 \sum_{s=0}^{a_1-2} 3^s$ . Hence

$$\tau(x, 3i, (-1)^{x-i}) = (-1)^{\bar{x}} \binom{\ell-1}{[x/3]} \equiv 2^j \equiv (-1)^j.$$

Here we have used that for  $\bar{x} = 0, 1$ , we have  $[\frac{x}{3}] = \sum_{j=\bar{x}+1}^t 3^{a_j}$ .

We complete the argument for Case 1 by proving the third part of (4.11). The binomial coefficient  $\binom{3x}{3i}$  is 0 unless  $3i = 3x - 3^{a_{j_1}} - \cdots - 3^{a_{j_r}}$  with  $j_1 < \cdots < j_r$ . We must have  $j_r = t$  or else  $x - 3i$  would be negative. Hence  $r > 2$ . If  $r = 2w + 1 > 1$  is odd, then

$$\tau(x, 3i, (-1)^{x-i}) = -\binom{\ell}{[x/3]}$$

with

$$2\ell+1 = x-3i = \sum_{j \notin \{j_1, \dots, j_r\}} (3^{a_{j+1}-1} - 3^{a_j}) + \sum_{h=1}^w (3^{a_{j_{2h+1}-1}} + 3^{a_{j_{2h}-1}}) + 3^{a_{j_1}-1},$$

and hence

$$\ell = \sum_{j \notin \{j_1, \dots, j_r\}} \sum_{i=a_j}^{a_{j+1}-2} 3^i + \sum_{h=1}^w \left( 3^{a_{j_{2h}-1}} + \sum_{i=a_{j_{2h}-1}}^{a_{j_{2h+1}-2}} 3^i \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{a_{j_1}-2} 3^i.$$

Using (2.11), we see that  $\binom{\ell}{[x/3]} \equiv 0$  by consideration of position  $a_{j_2} - 2$ . A similar argument works when  $r$  is even.

**Case 2:** We are comparing

$$f_1(x) = \sum \binom{3x}{3i} \tau(x, 3i, (-1)^{3x-3i})$$

with

$$f_1(3x) = \sum \binom{9x}{9i} \tau(3x, 9i, (-1)^{9x-9i}),$$

mod 3. Clearly the binomial coefficients agree. Let  $x = 3y + \delta$  with  $0 \leq \delta \leq 2$ .

If  $x - 3i = 2\ell$ , let  $Q = (x - 3i)/2$ . We have

$$\tau(x, 3i, 1) = (-1)^\delta \binom{Q-1}{y} \equiv \binom{3Q-1}{3y+\delta} = \tau(3x, 9i, 1).$$

If  $x - 3i = 2\ell + 1$ , let  $Q = (x - 3i - 1)/2$ . If  $\delta \neq 2$ , we have

$$\tau(x, 3i, -1) = -\binom{Q}{y} \equiv -\binom{3Q+1}{3y+\delta} = \tau(3x, 9i, -1),$$

while if  $\delta = 2$ , we have  $\tau(x, 3i, -1) = 0$  by 4.2, and  $\binom{3Q+1}{3y+\delta} = 0$ .

**Case 3:** Let  $x = 3y + \delta$  with  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ . Except for the single special term when  $x$  is sparse, we have  $f_1(x) = \sum \binom{3x}{3i} \tau(x, 3i, 1)$ , and will show that

$$f_1(3x + 1) = \sum \binom{9x+3}{9i+3} \tau(3x + 1, 9i + 3, 1). \quad (4.12)$$

If  $x - 3i = 2\ell$ , then  $\tau(x, 3i, 1) = (-1)^\delta \binom{\ell-1}{y}$  and  $\tau(3x+1, 9i+3, 1) = -\binom{3\ell-2}{3y+\delta} \equiv -\binom{\ell-1}{y}$  since  $\delta \neq 2$ . Thus  $f_1(3x + 1) = (-1)^{\delta+1} f_1(x)$ . To see that (4.12) contains all possible nonzero terms, note that terms  $\binom{9x+3}{9i} \tau(3x+1, 9i, (-1)^{x-i-1})$  contribute 0 to  $f_1(3x+1)$  since the  $\tau$ -part is  $-\binom{(3x-9i)/2}{x} \equiv 0$  or  $-\binom{(3x-9i-1)/2}{x} \equiv 0$ , since  $(x, i)$  is not special.

If  $x$  is sparse, the special term  $(x, i)$  contributes  $-1$  to  $f_1(x)$ . If also  $x \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then the corresponding term in (4.12) is  $\tau(3x + 1, 9i + 3, -1)$  with  $x - i$  odd, equaling  $-\binom{(3x-9i-3)/2}{x} \equiv -1$  by 4.7.(3). That the terms added to each are equal is consistent with  $f_1(3x + 1) = (-1)^{\delta+1} f_1(x)$ .

**Case 4:** Let  $x = 3y$ . Ignoring temporarily the special term when  $x$  is sparse, we have  $f_1(x) = \sum \binom{3x}{3i} \tau(x, 3i, 1)$  and will show that  $f_1(3x + 2) = \sum \binom{9x+6}{9i+6} \tau(3x + 2, 9i + 6, 1)$ . If  $x - 3i = 2\ell$ , then

$$\tau(x, 3i, 1) \equiv \binom{\ell-1}{y} \equiv \binom{3\ell-3}{3y} \equiv \tau(3x + 2, 9i + 6, 1).$$

If the  $9i + 6$  in the sum for  $f_1(3x + 2)$  is replaced by  $9i$  or  $9i + 3$ , then the associated  $\tau$  is 0, for different reasons in the two cases.

We illustrate what happens to a special term  $(x, i)$  when  $x$  is sparse, using the case  $x = 30$  and  $i = 3$ . It is perfectly typical. This term contributes  $-1$  to  $f_1(x)$ . We will show that it also contributes  $-1$  to  $f_1(3x + 2)$ , using  $9i + 3$  rather than  $9i + 6$ , which is what contributed in all the other cases. The reader can check that for terms with  $k = 9i + \langle 0, 3, 6 \rangle$ , the  $\tau$ -terms are, respectively

$$\tau(92, 27, -1) = 0, \tau(92, 30, 1) \equiv \binom{30}{30} \equiv 1, \tau(92, 33, -1) = 0.$$

The binomial coefficient accompanying the case  $i = 30$  is  $\binom{9 \cdot 30 + 6}{9 \cdot 3 + 3} \equiv 2$ . ■

Next we prove a theorem, similar to 4.8, which, with 4.3, implies another part of the “if” part of Theorem 1.9.

**Theorem 4.13.** *With  $T$  as in Theorem 1.9, if  $n \in (9T + 3)$  then  $\phi(n) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* We define  $f_3(x) = \phi(9x+3)$  and write  $2 \in x$  to mean that a 2 occurs somewhere in the 3-ary expansion of  $x$ . We organize the proof into four cases, which imply the result.

- (1) If  $2 \notin x$ , then  $f_3(x) \neq 0$ .
- (2) For all  $x$ ,  $f_3(3x) = f_3(x)$ .
- (3) For all  $x$ ,  $f_3(9x + 2) = f_3(x)$ .
- (4) If  $x$  is not sparse and  $x \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , then  $f_3(3x+1) = (-1)^{\bar{x}+1} f_3(x)$ .

**Case 1:** Let  $9x = \sum_{i=1}^t 3^{a_i}$  with  $a_i > a_{i-1}$  and  $a_1 \geq 2$ . Let  $i_0$  be the largest  $i \geq 1$  such that  $a_{i+1} - a_i = 1$ . Note that  $x$  is sparse iff no such  $i$  exists; let  $i_0 = 1$  in this situation. For any  $j$ , let  $p(j)$  denote the number of  $i \leq j$  for which  $a_{i-1} < a_i - 1$  or  $i = 1$ . We will sketch a proof that, mod 3,

$$\binom{9x+2}{k} \tau(3x+1, k, (-1)^{x-k}) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \cdot (-1)^{p(j)+1} & k = 9x+2-3^{a_t}-3^{a_j}, i_0 \leq j < t \\ 2 \cdot (-1) & k = 9x+1-3^{a_t}, n \text{ sparse} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

We have written the values in a form which separates the binomial coefficient factor from the  $\tau$  factor. The binomial coefficient factor follows from (2.11). One readily verifies from (4.14) that the nonzero terms in (4.4) written in increasing  $k$ -order alternate between 1 and  $-1$  until the last one which repeats its predecessor. Thus the sum is nonzero.

The hard part in all of these is discovering the formula; then the verifications are straightforward, and extremely similar to those of the preceding proof. We give one, that shows where  $(-1)^{p(j)+1}$  comes from.

If  $k = 9x+2-3^{a_t}-3^{a_j} = 2+3^{a_1}+\dots+3^{a_{j-1}}+3^{a_{j+1}}+\dots+3^{a_{t-1}}$ , then  $3x+1-k = 2\ell+1$  with

$$\ell = \sum_{\substack{i=2 \\ i \neq j+1}}^t \sum_{s=a_{i-1}}^{a_i-2} 3^s + \sum_{s=0}^{a_{j+1}-2} 3^s + \sum_{s=0}^{a_1-2} 3^s.$$

We desire  $\tau(3x+1, k, 1) = -\binom{\ell}{x}$  with  $x = \sum_{i=1}^t 3^{a_i-2}$ . Note that  $\ell$  has a  $3^{a_i-2}$ -summand for each  $i \neq j+1$  for which  $a_{i-1} \neq a_i - 1$ , and another for each  $i \leq j+1$ . Thus the 3-ary expansion of  $\ell$  will have 0 in position  $a_i - 2$ , causing  $\tau = 0$ , if  $i > j+1$

and  $a_i = a_{i-1} + 1$ . That explains the choice of  $i_0$ . If  $j \geq i_0$ , then  $\binom{\ell}{x}$  from (2.11) has a factor  $\binom{2}{1}$  in positions  $i$  enumerated by  $p(j)$ .

**Case 2:** If  $x$  is sparse, the result follows from the proof of Case 1, and so we assume  $x$  is not sparse. Then we are comparing

$$f_3(x) = \sum \binom{9x+2}{9i+2} \tau(3x+1, 9i+2, (-1)^{x-i}), \quad (4.15)$$

mod 3, with

$$f_3(3x) = \sum \binom{27x+2}{27i+2} \tau(9x+1, 27i+2, (-1)^{x-i}). \quad (4.16)$$

The binomial coefficients are clearly equal, mod 3. One can show that, for the other possible contributors to (4.16),  $\tau(9x+1, 27i+1, (-1)^{x-i+1}) = 0 = \tau(9x+1, 27i, (-1)^{x-i})$ . If  $x-i$  is odd, the  $\tau$ -terms in (4.15) and (4.16) are 0, while if  $x-i$  is even and  $Q = \frac{x-3i}{2}$ , then

$$\tau(3x+1, 9i+2, 1) \equiv -\binom{3Q-1}{x} \equiv -\binom{9Q-1}{3x} \equiv \tau(9x+1, 27i+2, 1).$$

**Case 3:** If  $x$  is not sparse, we are comparing

$$f_3(x) = \sum \binom{9x+2}{9i+2} \tau(3x+1, 9i+2, (-1)^{x-i})$$

with

$$f_3(9x+2) = \sum \binom{9(9x+2)+2}{9(9i+2)+2} \tau(3(9x+2)+1, 9(9i+2)+2, (-1)^{x-i}). \quad (4.17)$$

We will show below that no other terms can contribute to (4.17). Given this, then the binomial coefficients clearly agree, mod 3.

When  $x-i$  is odd, the terms in both sums are 0, since they are of the form  $\tau(3m+1, 3m+1-2\ell, -1)$ .

Suppose  $x-i$  is even. Let  $Q = \frac{x-3i}{2}$ . The first  $\tau$  is  $-\binom{3Q-1}{x}$ , while the second is the negative of  $\binom{27Q-7}{9x+2} \equiv \binom{3Q-1}{x}$ , as desired.

As a possible additional term in (4.17), if  $k = 9(9i+2)+2$  is replaced with  $k = 9(9i+\alpha)+\beta$  with  $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 2$ , which are the only ways to obtain a nonzero binomial coefficient, then we show that the relevant  $\tau$  is 0. Still assuming  $x-i$  even, if  $\alpha+\beta$  is odd, then we obtain  $\tau(3m+1, 3m+1-2\ell, -1) = 0$ , while if  $\beta = 0$  and  $\alpha \neq 1$ , then we obtain  $\tau = \binom{3y}{9x+2} \equiv 0$  for some  $y$ . Finally, if  $\beta = 2$  and  $\alpha = 0$ ,

$$\tau = \binom{9(3x-9i)/2+2}{9x+2} \equiv \binom{(3x-9i)/2}{x}.$$

Since, in order to have  $\binom{9(9x+2)+2}{9(9i+2)+2} \not\equiv 0$ , we must have  $\nu_3(i) \geq \nu_3(x)$ , we conclude  $\binom{(3x-9i)/2}{x} \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . The case  $x - i$  odd is handled similarly.

If  $9x = 3^{a_1} + \dots + 3^{a_t}$  is sparse and  $9i = 9x - 3^{a_t}$ , there is an additional term,  $\binom{9x+2}{9i+1} \tau(3x+1, 9i+1, 1) \equiv 1$ , in the sum for  $f_3(x)$ . The additional term in  $f_3(9x+2)$  is

$$\binom{9(9x+2)+2}{9(9i+1)+2} \tau(3(9x+2)+1, 9(9i+1)+2, 1) \equiv \binom{\ell}{m},$$

with  $m = 9x + 2 = 2 + 3^{a_1} + \dots + 3^{a_t}$ , and  $2\ell + 1 = 3(9x+2) + 1 - 9(9i+1) - 2$ , so that

$$\ell = \sum_{j=2}^t \sum_{s=a_{j-1}+2}^{a_j} 3^s + \sum_{s=2}^{a_1} 3^s + 2,$$

and so the additional term in  $f(9x+2)$  is 1.

**Case 4:** We first show

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{\bar{x}+1} f_3(x) &= (-1)^{\bar{x}+1} \sum \binom{9x+2}{9i+2} \tau(3x+1, 9i+2, (-1)^{x-i}) \\ &= \sum \binom{27x+11}{27i+11} \tau(9x+4, 27i+11, (-1)^{x-i}) \\ &= f_3(3x+1) \end{aligned}$$

for  $x \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{3}$ . Both  $\tau$ 's are 0 if  $x - i$  is odd, while if  $x - i$  is even and  $x \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{3}$ , then

$$(-1)^{\bar{x}+1} \tau(3x+1, 9i+2, 1) \equiv (-1)^{\bar{x}} \binom{3Q+2}{x} \equiv -\binom{9Q+5}{3x+1} = \tau(9x+4, 27i+11, 1),$$

where  $Q = (x - 3i - 2)/2$ .

We must also show that  $\binom{27x+11}{k} \tau(9x+4, k, (-1)^{x+1-k}) \equiv 0$  for  $k \not\equiv 11 \pmod{27}$ . When  $k \equiv 2 \pmod{27}$ , the result follows from Lemma 4.7. When  $k \equiv 0, 9 \pmod{27}$ ,  $\tau$  is of the form  $\binom{3A}{3x+1} \equiv 0$ . ■

The “if” part of Theorem 1.9 when  $n = 3T' + 2$  divides into two parts, Theorems 4.18 and 4.22, noting that  $3T' + 2 = (9T' + 2) \cup (9T' + 5)$ .

**Theorem 4.18.** *If  $T$  is as in 1.9 and  $n \in (9T' + 5)$ , then  $\phi(n) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f_5(x) = \phi(9x+5)$ . We will prove that if  $x \in T'$  then

$$f_5(x) = (-1)^{\bar{x}} f_3(x). \quad (4.19)$$

With Theorem 4.13, this implies the result.

**Case 1:** Assume  $x$  not sparse and recall  $x \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . We show that, mod 3,

$$\binom{9x+4}{k} \tau(3x+1, k, (-1)^{9x+4-k}) \equiv (-1)^{\bar{x}} \binom{9x+2}{k-2} \tau(3x+1, k-2, (-1)^{9x+4-k}). \quad (4.20)$$

Since  $f_5(x)$  is the sum over  $k$  of the LHS, and  $(-1)^{\bar{x}} f_3(x)$  the sum over  $k$  of the RHS, (4.19) will follow when  $x$  is not sparse.

We first deal with cases when the RHS of (4.20) is nonzero. By the proof of 4.13, this can only happen when  $k-2 = 9i+2$ ,  $\binom{x}{i} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , and  $x-i$  is even. Mod 3, we have  $\binom{9x+4}{9i+4} \equiv \binom{9x+2}{9i+2}$  by (2.11). The two  $\tau$ 's in (4.20) are, with  $Q := \frac{3x-9i}{2}$ ,  $-\binom{Q-2}{x}$  and  $-\binom{Q-1}{x}$ , respectively. Since  $Q \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , these are equal if  $x \equiv 0$  and negatives if  $x \equiv 1$ .

We conclude the proof of (4.20) by showing that other values of  $k$  cause  $\binom{9x+4}{k} \tau(3x+1, k, (-1)^{x-k}) \equiv 0$ . If  $k \not\equiv 0, 1, 3, 4 \pmod{9}$ , then  $\binom{9x+4}{k} \equiv 0$ . If  $k = 9i+1$  or  $9i+3$  and  $x-i$  even, or if  $k = 9i$  or  $9i+4$  and  $x-i$  odd, then  $\tau = 0$  by 4.2. If  $k = 9i$  and  $x-i$  is even, then  $\tau \equiv \binom{3x-9i}{x} \equiv 0$ . For  $k = 9i+1$  or  $9i+3$  and  $x-i$  odd, the result follows from Lemma 4.7.

**Case 2:** Assume  $x$  is sparse. Let  $9x = \sum_{j=1}^t 3^{a_j}$  with  $a_j - a_{j-1} \geq 2$ . We call  $k = 9i+d$ ,  $d \in \{0, 1, 3, 4\}$ , special if  $(9x, 9i)$  is special. The analysis of Case 1 shows that the  $f_5$ -sum over non-special values of  $k$  equals  $(-1)^{\bar{x}}$  times the  $f_3$ -sum over non-special values of  $k$ .

We saw in (4.14) that the only special value of  $k$  giving a nonzero summand for  $f_3(x)$  is  $k = 9i+1$  (with  $9i = 9x - 3^{a_t}$ ) and this summand is 1. We will show that if  $x \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then the only special value of  $k$  giving a nonzero summand for  $f_5(x)$  is  $k = 9i+1$ , and it gives  $-1$ , while if  $x \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , both  $k = 9i+1$  and  $k = 9i+3$  give summands of  $-1$  for  $f_5(x)$ . This will imply the claim.

Recall  $9i = 9x - 3^{a_t}$ , and hence  $x-i$  is odd. If  $k = 9i + \langle 0, 4 \rangle$ , then the  $\tau$ -factor is  $\tau(3x+1, 9i + \langle 0, 4 \rangle, -1) = 0$ . If  $k = 9i + \langle 1, 3 \rangle$ , the relevant term in  $f_5(x)$  is

$$\binom{9x+4}{9i+\langle 1, 3 \rangle} \tau(3x+1, 9i + \langle 1, 3 \rangle, 1) = -\binom{\ell}{x},$$

where

$$\ell = \sum_{i=2}^t \sum_{s=a_{i-1}}^{a_i-2} 3^s + \sum_{s=0}^{a_1-2} 3^s + \langle 0, -1 \rangle.$$

Using (2.11),  $\binom{\ell}{x} \equiv 1$  in the  $(9i+1)$ -case, while in the  $(9i+3)$ -case

$$\binom{\ell}{x} \equiv \left( \frac{(\sum_{s=0}^{a_1-2} 3^s) - 1}{3^{a_1-2}} \right),$$

which is 0 if  $x \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , since then  $a_1 = 2$ , but is 1 if  $x \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  since then  $a_1 \geq 3$ .  $\blacksquare$

When  $n \in (9T+2)$ , the equality of  $e_3(n-1, n)$  and  $s_3(n)$  in Theorem 1.9 comes not from  $\nu_3(a_3(n-1, n))$ , as it has in the other cases, but rather from  $\nu_3(a_3(n-1, n+1))$ . To see this, we first extend Theorem 4.3, as follows.

**Theorem 4.21.** *If  $N \geq n$ , then  $\nu_3(a_3(n-1, N)) = s_3(n)$  iff  $[N/9] = [n/9]$  and*

$$\sum \binom{n-1}{k} \tau\left(\left[\frac{N}{3}\right], k, (-1)^{n-k-1}\right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}.$$

*Proof.* This is very similar to the proof, centered around (2.7), that Theorem 2.2 implies Theorem 1.7. We have

$$0 = (-1)^N S(n-1, N) N! = a_3(n-1, N) + 3^{n-1} \sum (-1)^k \binom{N}{3k} k^{n-1}.$$

Thus  $\nu_3(a_3(n-1, N)) = s_3(n)$  iff  $B \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , where, mod 3,

$$\begin{aligned} B &:= \frac{1}{[n/3]!} \sum (-1)^k \binom{N}{3k} k^{n-1} \\ &\equiv \sum_{d=1}^2 \frac{1}{[n/3]!} \sum_{k \equiv d \pmod{3}} (-1)^k \binom{N}{3k} k^{n-1} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{[n/3]!} \sum_{d=1}^2 (-1)^d \sum_j (-1)^j \binom{N}{9j+3d} \sum_{\ell} 3^{\ell} j^{\ell} \binom{n-1}{\ell} d^{n-1-\ell} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{[n/3]!} \sum_{d=1}^2 (-1)^d \sum_j (-1)^j \binom{N}{9j+3d} \sum_{\ell} 3^{\ell} \binom{n-1}{\ell} d^{n-1-\ell} \sum_i S(\ell, i) i! \binom{j}{i} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{[n/3]!} \sum_{d=1}^2 (-1)^d \sum_j (-1)^j \binom{N}{9j+3d} \sum_i 3^i \binom{n-1}{i} d^{n-1-i} i! \binom{j}{i} \\ &\equiv \frac{[N/3]!}{[n/3]!} \sum_i \binom{n-1}{i} (T_{i,2}(N, 3) + (-1)^{n-1-i} T_{i,2}(N, 6)) \\ &\equiv \frac{[N/3]!}{[n/3]!} \sum_i \binom{n-1}{i} (T_{i,1}([N/3], 1) + (-1)^{n-1-i} T_{i,1}([N/3], 2)) \\ &= \frac{[N/3]!}{[n/3]!} \sum_i \binom{n-1}{i} \tau\left(\left[\frac{N}{3}\right], i, (-1)^{n-i-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

$\blacksquare$

The “if” part of 1.9 when  $n \in (9T + 2)$  now follows from Theorem 4.21 and the following result.

**Theorem 4.22.** *If  $T$  is as in 1.9 and  $n \in (9T + 2)$ , then*

$$\sum \binom{n-1}{k} \tau\left(\left[\frac{n+1}{3}\right], k, (-1)^{n-k-1}\right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}.$$

*Proof.* We prove that for such  $n$

$$\sum \binom{n-1}{k} \tau\left(\left[\frac{n+1}{3}\right], k, (-1)^{n-k-1}\right) \equiv \sum \binom{n}{k} \tau\left(\left[\frac{n+1}{3}\right], k, (-1)^{n-k}\right) \pmod{3} \quad (4.23)$$

and then apply Theorem 4.13. Note that the RHS is  $\phi(n+1)$ .

If  $n = 9x + 2$  with  $x$  not sparse, then the proof of 4.13 shows that the nonzero terms of the RHS of (4.23) occur for  $k = 9i + 2$  with  $\binom{x}{i} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $x - i$  even. Now (4.23) in this case follows from

$$\binom{9x+1}{9i+1} \tau(3x+1, 9i+1, 1) \equiv -\binom{x}{i} \binom{(3x-9i-2)/2}{x} \equiv \binom{9x+2}{9i+2} \tau(3x+1, 9i+2, 1). \quad (4.24)$$

One must also verify that no other values of  $k$  contribute to the LHS of (4.23); this is done by the usual methods.

If  $n = 9x + 2$  with  $x$  sparse, (4.24) holds unless  $(x, i)$  is special. For such  $i$ , the contribution to the RHS of (4.23) using  $k = 9i + 1$  is  $2 \cdot 2 \equiv 1$ . The LHS of (4.23) obtains contributions of  $1 \cdot 2$  from both  $k = 9i$  and  $k = 9i + 1$ . Indeed both  $\tau$ ’s equal  $-\binom{(3x-9i-1)/2}{x} \equiv -1$  by 4.7. ■

The “if” part of Theorem 1.9 is an immediate consequence of Theorems 4.8, 4.13, 4.18, and 4.22. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.9 by proving the following result.

**Proposition 4.25.** *If  $n$  is not one of the integers described in Theorem 1.9, then for all integers  $N \geq n$  satisfying  $[N/9] = [n/9]$ , we have*

$$\sum \binom{n-1}{k} \tau\left(\left[\frac{N}{3}\right], k, (-1)^{n-k-1}\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}.$$

*Proof.* We break into cases depending on  $n \pmod{9}$ , and argue by induction on  $n$  with the integers ordered so that  $9x + 3$  immediately precedes  $9x + 2$ .

**Case 1:**  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{9}$ . Let  $n = 9a$ . If  $\lfloor \frac{N}{3} \rfloor = 3a$  or  $3a+2$ , then  $\tau(\lfloor \frac{N}{3} \rfloor, k, (-1)^{a-1-k}) = 0$  by 4.2. Now suppose  $\lfloor \frac{N}{3} \rfloor = 3a+1$ . We show that for each nonzero term in

$$\sum_k \binom{9a-1}{k} \tau(3a+1, k, (-1)^{a-k-1})$$

with  $a-k$  odd, the  $(k+1)$ -term is the negative of the  $k$ -term. Thus the sum is 0.

Both  $\tau$ 's equal  $-\binom{(3a-k-1)/2}{a}$ . Since  $\binom{9a-1}{k} + \binom{9a-1}{k+1} = \binom{9a}{k+1}$ , the binomial coefficients are negatives of one another unless  $k+1 = 9t$  with  $\binom{a}{t} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Then  $\nu(t) \geq \nu(a)$  and so  $\binom{(3a-k-1)/2}{a} = \binom{(3a-9t)/2}{a} \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , so the  $\tau$ 's were 0.

**Case 2:**  $n \equiv 6, 7, 8 \pmod{9}$ . In these cases,  $\lfloor N/9 \rfloor = \lfloor n/9 \rfloor$  implies  $\lfloor N/3 \rfloor = \lfloor n/3 \rfloor$  and so we need not consider  $N > n$ . By 4.2,  $\tau(3x+2, k, (-1)^{x+1-k}) = 0$ , which implies  $\phi(9x+6) = 0 = \phi(9x+8)$ . We have

$$\phi(9x+7) = \sum_k \binom{9x+6}{k} \tau(3x+2, k, (-1)^{x-k}).$$

This is 0 if  $x-k$  is odd, while if  $x-k$  is even, a summand is  $\binom{9x+6}{k} \binom{(3x-k)/2}{x}$ , which is 0 unless  $k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and hence  $x \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . In the latter case, with  $x = 3x'$  and  $f_1$  as in the proof of 4.8, we have  $\phi(n) = f_1(9x'+2)$ , which, by Case 4 of the proof of 4.8, equals  $f_1(3x')$ , and this is 0 by induction unless  $x' \in T$ .

**Case 3:**  $n = 9x+5$ . If  $x \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{3}$ , then  $\phi(9x+5) = \pm\phi(9x+3)$  was proved in Case 1 of the proof of 4.18. The induction hypothesis thus implies the result for  $N = n$  in these cases. If  $x = 3y+2$ , then

$$\phi(n) = \sum_k \binom{27y+22}{k} \tau(9y+7, k, (-1)^{y-k}).$$

The  $k$ -term is 0 if  $y-k$  is odd, while if  $y-k$  is even,  $\tau = -\binom{(9y+6-k)/2}{3y+2}$ . This is 0 unless  $k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , but then  $\binom{27y+22}{k} \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . The  $k$ -term for  $N = n+1$  is nonzero iff the  $k$ -term in  $\phi(n)$  is nonzero; this is true because  $\tau(3z+2, k, (-1)^{z-k}) = \pm\tau(3z+1, k, (-1)^{z-k})$ . Thus the sum for  $N = n+1$  is 0 if  $x \notin T'$ .

**Case 4:**  $n = 9x+2$ . Since, for  $\epsilon = 0$  or  $2$ ,  $\tau(3x+\epsilon, k, (-1)^{x-k+1}) = 0$ , we deduce that  $\sum \binom{n-1}{k} \tau(\lfloor \frac{N}{3} \rfloor, k, (-1)^{n-k-1}) = 0$  for  $N = n$  and  $N = n+4$ . For  $N = n+1$ , this is just the LHS of (4.23). By (4.23), it equals  $\phi(n+1)$ , which is 0 for  $x \notin T$  by the induction hypothesis.

**Case 5:**  $n = 9x + 3$ . Let  $f_3(x) = \phi(9x + 3)$ . Let  $x$  be minimal such that  $x \notin T$  and  $f_3(x)$  has a nonzero summand. By the proof of 4.13,  $x$  is not 0 mod 3, 2 mod 9, 1 mod 9, or 4 mod 9.

If  $x \equiv 5, 7$ , or  $8 \pmod{9}$ , then  $f_3(x)$  has no nonzero summands. For example, if  $x = 9t + 7$ , the summands are  $\binom{81t+65}{k} \tau(27t + 22, k, (-1)^{t-k-1})$ . This is 0 if  $t - k$  is even, while if  $t - k$  is odd, the  $\tau$ -factor is  $\binom{(27t+21-k)/2}{9t+7}$ . For this to be nonzero, we must have  $k \equiv 5$  or  $7 \pmod{9}$ , but these make the first factor 0. Other cases are handled similarly.

One can show that for  $\epsilon = 0, 1, 2$ ,

$$\tau(3x + 2, 9i + \epsilon, (-1)^{x-i-\epsilon}) = \pm \tau(3x + 1, 9i + \epsilon, (-1)^{x-i-\epsilon}) \in \mathbb{Z}/3.$$

This implies that when we use  $N = n + 3$ , nonzero terms will be obtained iff they were obtained for  $n$ .

**Case 6:**  $n \equiv 1, 4 \pmod{9}$ . Let  $f_1(x) = \phi(3x + 1)$ . By the proof of Theorem 4.8, there can be no smallest  $x \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{3}$  which is not in  $T$  and has  $f_1(x) \neq 0$ . When using  $N = n + 2$  or, if  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{9}$ ,  $N = n + 5$ , then the  $k$ -summands,  $\binom{9x}{k} \tau(3x + 1, k, (-1)^{x-k})$ ,  $\binom{9x+3}{k} \tau(3x + 2, k, (-1)^{x+1-k})$ , and  $\binom{9x}{k} \tau(3x + 2, k, (-1)^{x-k})$ , are easily seen to be 0. ■

## 5. DISCUSSION OF CONJECTURE 1.17

In this section we discuss the relationship between  $\bar{e}_2(n)$ ,  $e_2(n - 1, n)$ , and  $s_2(n)$ . In particular, we discuss an approach to Conjecture 1.17, which suggests that the inequality  $e_2(n - 1, n) \geq s_2(n)$  fails by 1 to be sharp if  $n = 2^t$ , while if  $n = 2^t + 1$ , it is sharp but the maximum value of  $e_2(k, n)$  occurs for a value of  $k \neq n - 1$ . The prime  $p = 2$  is implicit in this section; in particular,  $\nu(-) = \nu_2(-)$  and  $a(-, -) = a_2(-, -)$ .

Although our focus will be on the two families of  $n$  with which Conjecture 1.17 deals, we are also interested, more generally, in the extent to which equality is obtained in each of the inequalities of

$$s_2(n) \leq e_2(n - 1, n) \leq \bar{e}_2(n). \quad (5.1)$$

In Table 1, we list the three items related in (5.1) for  $2 \leq n \leq 38$ , and also the smallest positive  $k$  for which  $e_2(k, n) = \bar{e}_2(n)$ . We denote this as  $k_{\max}$ , since it is the

simplest  $k$ -value giving the maximum value of  $e_2(k, n)$ . Note that in this range  $k_{\max}$  always equals  $n - 1$  plus possibly a number which is rather highly 2-divisible.

We return to more specific information leading to Conjecture 1.17. To obtain the value of  $\bar{e}_2(n)$ , we focus on large values of  $e_2(k, n)$ . For  $n = 2^t$  and  $2^t + 1$ , this is done in the following conjecture, which implies Conjecture 1.17. Note that  $s_2(2^t) = 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 2$ , and  $s_2(2^t + 1) = 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 1$ . We employ the usual convention  $\nu(0) = \infty$ .

**Conjecture 5.2.** *If  $t \geq 3$ , then*

$$e_2(k, 2^t) \begin{cases} = \min(\nu(k + 1 - 2^t) + 2^t - t, 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 1) & \text{if } k \equiv -1 \pmod{2^{t-1}} \\ < 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 1 & \text{if } k \not\equiv -1 \pmod{2^{t-1}}; \end{cases}$$

$$e_2(k, 2^t + 1) \begin{cases} = \min(\nu(k - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t-1}) + 2^t - t, 2^t + 2^{t-1}) & \text{if } k \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{t-1}} \\ < 2^t + 2^{t-1} & \text{if } k \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2^{t-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Note from this that conjecturally the smallest positive value of  $k$  for which  $e_2(k, n)$  achieves its maximum value is  $n - 1$  when  $n = 2^t$  but is  $n - 1 + 2^{2^{t-1}+t-1}$  when  $n = 2^t + 1$ . The reason for this is explained in the next result, involving a comparison of the smallest  $\nu(a(k, j))$  values.

**Conjecture 5.3.** *There exist odd 2-adic integers  $u$ , whose precise value varies from case to case, such that*

(1) *if  $k \equiv -1 \pmod{2^{t-1}}$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(a(k, 2^t + 1)) &= \nu(k + 1 - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t-1}u) + 2^t - t \\ \nu(a(k, 2^t + 2)) &= \nu(k + 1 - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t-2}u) + 2^t - t + 1 \\ \nu(a(k, 2^t + 3)) &= \nu(k + 1 - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t-2}u) + 2^t - t + 1; \end{aligned}$$

(2) *if  $k \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{t-1}}$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(a(k, 2^t + 1)) &= \nu(k - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t-1}u) + 2^t - t \\ \nu(a(k, 2^t + 2)) &= \nu(k - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t}u) + 2^t - t + 1 \\ \nu(a(k, 2^t + 3)) &= \nu(k - 2^t - 2^{2^{t-1}+t-2}u) + 2^t - t + 2. \end{aligned}$$

*For other values of  $j \geq 2^t$  (resp.  $2^t + 1$ ),  $\nu(a(k, j))$  is at least as large as all the values appearing on the RHS above.*

TABLE 1. Comparison for (5.1) when  $p = 2$ 

| $n$ | $s_2(n)$ | $e_2(n, n-1)$ | $\bar{e}_2(n)$ | $k_{\max}$     |
|-----|----------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2   | 1        | 1             | 1              | 1              |
| 3   | 2        | 2             | 2              | 2              |
| 4   | 4        | 4             | 4              | 3              |
| 5   | 5        | 5             | 6              | $4 + 2^3$      |
| 6   | 6        | 6             | 8              | $5 + 2^3$      |
| 7   | 7        | 8             | 8              | 6              |
| 8   | 10       | 11            | 11             | 7              |
| 9   | 11       | 11            | 12             | $8 + 2^6$      |
| 10  | 12       | 12            | 14             | $9 + 2^6$      |
| 11  | 13       | 13            | 15             | $10 + 2^6$     |
| 12  | 15       | 15            | 15             | 11             |
| 13  | 16       | 18            | 18             | 12             |
| 14  | 17       | 21            | 21             | 13             |
| 15  | 18       | 22            | 22             | 14             |
| 16  | 22       | 23            | 23             | 15             |
| 17  | 23       | 23            | 24             | $16 + 2^{11}$  |
| 18  | 24       | 24            | 26             | $17 + 2^{11}$  |
| 19  | 25       | 25            | 28             | $18 + 2^{11}$  |
| 20  | 27       | 27            | 28             | $19 + 2^{11}$  |
| 21  | 28       | 28            | 28             | 20             |
| 22  | 29       | 29            | 30             | $21 + 2^{10}$  |
| 23  | 30       | 31            | 31             | 22             |
| 24  | 33       | 34            | 34             | 23             |
| 25  | 34       | 36            | 38             | $24 + 2^{16}$  |
| 26  | 35       | 37            | 40             | $25 + 2^{16}5$ |
| 27  | 36       | 38            | 40             | $26 + 2^{16}$  |
| 28  | 38       | 40            | 40             | 27             |
| 29  | 39       | 42            | 44             | $28 + 2^{18}$  |
| 30  | 40       | 43            | 45             | $29 + 2^{18}$  |
| 31  | 41       | 46            | 46             | 30             |
| 32  | 46       | 47            | 47             | 31             |
| 33  | 47       | 47            | 48             | $32 + 2^{20}$  |
| 34  | 48       | 48            | 50             | $33 + 2^{20}$  |
| 35  | 49       | 49            | 52             | $34 + 2^{20}$  |
| 36  | 51       | 51            | 53             | $35 + 2^{20}$  |
| 37  | 52       | 52            | 54             | $36 + 2^{20}3$ |
| 38  | 53       | 53            | 56             | $37 + 2^{20}7$ |

Note that, for fixed  $j$ ,  $\nu(a(k, j))$  is an unbounded function of  $k$ ; it is the interplay among several values of  $j$  which causes the boundedness of  $e_2(k, n)$  for fixed  $n$ .

We show now that Conjecture 5.3 implies the “= min”-part of Conjecture 5.2. In part (1), the smallest  $\nu(a(k, j))$  for  $j \geq 2^t$  is

$$\begin{cases} \nu(k+1-2^t) + 2^t - t & \text{if } \nu(k+1-2^t) \leq 2^{t-1} + t - 2, \text{ using } j = 2^t + 1 \\ 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 1 & \text{if } \nu(k+1-2^t) = 2^{t-1} + t - 1, \text{ using } j = 2^t + 2 \\ 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 1 & \text{if } \nu(k+1-2^t) > 2^{t-1} + t - 1, \text{ using either.} \end{cases}$$

In part (2), the smallest  $\nu(a(k, j))$  for  $j \geq 2^t + 1$  is

$$\begin{cases} \nu(k-2^t) + 2^t - t & \text{if } \nu(k-2^t) \leq 2^{t-1} + t - 2, \text{ using } j = 2^t + 1 \\ 2^t + 2^{t-1} & \text{if } \nu(k-2^t) = 2^{t-1} + t - 1, \text{ using } j = 2^t + 2 \\ 2^t + 2^{t-1} - 1 & \text{if } \nu(k-2^t) \geq 2^{t-1} + t, \text{ using } j = 2^t + 1. \end{cases}$$

Conjecture 5.3 can be thought of as an application of Hensel’s Lemma, following Clarke ([2]). We are finding the first few terms of the unique zero of the 2-adic function  $f(x) = \nu(a(x, 2^t + \epsilon))$  for  $x$  in a restricted congruence class.

## 6. RELATIONSHIPS WITH ALGEBRAIC TOPOLOGY

In this section, we sketch how the numbers studied in this paper are related to topics in algebraic topology, namely James numbers and  $v_1$ -periodic homotopy groups.

Let  $W_{n,k}$  denote the complex Stiefel manifold consisting of  $k$ -tuples of orthonormal vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , and  $W_{n,k} \rightarrow S^{2n-1}$  the map which selects the first vector. In work related to vector fields on spheres, James ([8]) defined  $U(n, k)$  to be the order of the cokernel of

$$\pi_{2n-1}(W_{n,k}) \rightarrow \pi_{2n-1}(S^{2n-1}) \approx \mathbb{Z},$$

now called James numbers. A bibliography of many papers in algebraic topology devoted to studying these numbers can be found in [4]. It is proved in [11] that

$$\nu_p(U(n, k)) \geq \nu_p((n-1)!) - \tilde{e}_p(n-1, n-k).$$

Our work implies the following sharp result for certain James numbers.

**Theorem 6.1.** *If  $p = 2$  or  $3$ ,  $n$  is as in Theorems 1.7 or 1.9, and  $L$  is sufficiently large, then*

$$\nu_p(U((p-1)p^L + n, (p-1)p^L)) = p^L - (p-1)\left[\frac{n}{p}\right] - \nu_p(n) - \bar{n}.$$

*Proof.* We present the argument when  $p = 3$ . By [4, 4.3] and 1.9, we have

$$\nu_3(U(2 \cdot 3^L + n, 2 \cdot 3^L)) = \nu_3((2 \cdot 3^L + n - 1)!) - (n - 1 + \nu_3([n/3]!)).$$

Using Proposition 3.1, this equals

$$\frac{1}{2}(2 \cdot 3^L - n - 1 - d_3(n - 1) - \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor + d_3(\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor)).$$

If  $\bar{n} \neq 0$  and  $n = 3m + \bar{n}$ , this equals  $3^L - 2m - \bar{n}$ , while if  $n = 3m$ , we use  $d_3(k - 1) = d_3(k) - 1 + 2\nu_3(k)$  to obtain  $3^L - 2m - \nu_3(3m)$ . ■

The  $p$ -primary  $v_1$ -periodic homotopy groups of a topological space  $X$ , denoted  $v_1^{-1}\pi_*(X)_{(p)}$  and defined in [5], are a first approximation to the  $p$ -primary actual homotopy groups  $\pi_*(X)_{(p)}$ . Each group  $v_1^{-1}\pi_i(X)_{(p)}$  is a direct summand of some homotopy group  $\pi_j(X)$ . It was proved in [4] that for the special unitary group  $SU(n)$ , we have, if  $p$  or  $n$  is odd,

$$v_1^{-1}\pi_{2k}(SU(n))_{(p)} \approx \mathbb{Z}/p^{e_p(k,n)},$$

and  $v_1^{-1}\pi_{2k-1}(SU(n))_{(p)}$  has the same order. The situation when  $p = 2$  and  $n$  is even is slightly more complicated; it was discussed in [1] and [6]. In this case, there is a summand  $\mathbb{Z}/2^{e_2(k,n)}$  or  $\mathbb{Z}/2^{e_2(k,n)-1}$  in  $v_1^{-1}\pi_{2k}(SU(n))_{(2)}$ . From Theorems 1.9 and 1.7 we immediately obtain

**Corollary 6.2.** *If  $n$  is as in Theorem 1.9 and  $k \equiv n - 1 \pmod{2 \cdot 3^{s_3(n)}}$ , then*

$$v_1^{-1}\pi_{2k}(SU(n))_{(3)} \approx \mathbb{Z}/3^{s_3(n)}.$$

*If  $n$  is as in Theorem 1.7 and is odd, and  $k \equiv n - 1 \pmod{2^{s_2(n)-1}}$ , then*

$$v_1^{-1}\pi_{2k}(SU(n))_{(2)} \approx \mathbb{Z}/2^{s_2(n)}.$$

We are especially interested in knowing the largest value of  $e_p(k, n)$  as  $k$  varies over all integers, as this gives a lower bound for  $\exp_p(SU(n))$ , the largest  $p$ -exponent of any homotopy group of the space. It was shown in [7] that this is  $\geq s_p(n)$  if  $p$  or  $n$  is odd. Our work here immediately implies Corollary 6.3 since  $v_1^{-1}\pi_{2n-2}(SU(n))_{(p)}$  has  $p$ -exponent greater than  $s_p(n)$  in these cases.

**Corollary 6.3.** *If  $p = 3$  and  $n$  is not as in 1.9 or  $p = 2$  and  $n$  is odd and not as in 1.7, then  $\exp_p(SU(n)) > s_p(n)$ .*

Table 1 illustrates how we expect that  $k = n - 1$  will give almost the largest group  $v_1^{-1}\pi_{2k}(SU(n))_{(p)}$ , but may miss by a small amount. There is much more that might be done along these lines.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bendersky and D. M. Davis, *2-primary  $v_1$ -periodic homotopy groups of  $SU(n)$* , Amer. J. Math. **114** (1991) 529–544.
- [2] F. Clarke, *Hensel’s Lemma and the divisibility of Stirling-like numbers*, Jour Number Theory **52** (1995) 69–84.
- [3] M. C. Crabb and K. Knapp, *The Hurewicz map on stunted complex projective spaces*, Amer Jour Math **110** (1988) 783–809.
- [4] D. M. Davis,  *$v_1$ -periodic homotopy groups of  $SU(n)$  at odd primes*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **43** (1991) 529–541.
- [5] D. M. Davis and M. Mahowald, *Some remarks on  $v_1$ -periodic homotopy groups*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Notes **176** (1992) 55–72.
- [6] D. M. Davis and K. Potocka, *2-primary  $v_1$ -periodic homotopy groups of  $SU(n)$  revisited*, Forum Math **19** (2007) 783–822.
- [7] D. M. Davis and Z. W. Sun, *A number-theoretic approach to homotopy exponents of  $SU(n)$* , Jour Pure Appl Alg **209** (2007) 57–69.
- [8] I. M. James, *Cross-sections of Stiefel manifolds*, Proc London Math Soc **8** (1958) 536–547.
- [9] T. Lengyel, *On the orders of lacunary binomial coefficient sums*, INTEGERS, Electronic Jour of Combinatorial Number Theory **A3** (2003) 1–10.
- [10] A. T. Lundell, *A divisibility property for Stirling numbers*, Jour Number Theory **10** (1978) 35–54.
- [11] ———, *Generalized  $e$ -invariants and the numbers of James*, Quar Jour Math Oxford **25** (1974) 427–440.
- [12] Z. W. Sun and D. M. Davis, *Combinatorial congruences modulo prime powers*, Trans Amer Math Soc **359** (2007) 5525–5553.
- [13] C. S. Weisman, *Some congruences for binomial coefficients*, Mich Math Jour **24** (1977) 141–151.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, BETHLEHEM, PA 18015, USA  
*E-mail address:* dmd1@lehigh.edu